Are preserved why
May be ~~destroyed~~.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Ans 26/11/17

File No. 252-15

1915. 16

Serial Nos. 1-2

(Courts)

Later references.

No 173-M.2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-2

Part B for Sept 16.

SUBJECT.

Grant of addl increments to certain Officials of the Courts of the Dts and the subordinate Judges

---

2) To the Reg. Chf Co } J/81-2
" Compte } Dy 25/8/16
5/9/16

Accords sanction to the above

Approved 18/10/16

WD 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

(For disposal at a meeting)

No. C. 446

17/5/1916.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Council Matter.

SUBJECT.

(Clause xv of the Schedule)

Proposals for the grant of additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of the District and the Subordinate Judges

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

17th May 1916.

By Order,

Under Secretary to Government.

Extraordinary Member of Council.

74
18.5.16

First Member of Council. W/18.5 Opinion recorded

Second Member of Council. Opinion recorded

WD 2012—GPB—1 000—9·2·16

G. R. S. 11] 1915-16

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Courts)

NOTES.

File No. 252

FILE HEADING.

Request for the grant of maximum pay or additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of the District Judges and the Subordinate Judges.

From

The Registrar, Chief Court

No. 4001/305 Dated 18/21. 2. 1916 Received 20/23 - 2-1916

Diary No. J2350	Enclos. 3 Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for the orders of Govt copies of memorials addressed to the Chief Court by the officials representing that most of them have been drawing their present pay for several years, that while the pay of the officials in the Municipal Courts was raised by a lump sum, their pay was raised only by small annual increments and requesting that they may be granted the maximum pay under the revision scheme or as many increments as they might have earned by past service.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) The grievance complained of is not peculiar to these officials but is common to all those who are promoted to appointments on progressive pay. No doubt the officials in the Municipal Courts

NOTES—First Sheet.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | C5 File No. 252 of 1915-16

Serial No.

except the Court Inspts, actually got an increase to their pay from 1st July 1915 whereas the Sheristedars and Head Munshis of Subordinate Courts and the officials of the Dist Courts (except the Sheristedars & apprentice clerks) have to wait till next July for an increment. But it may be pointed out that while the prospective promotion[x] in the case of most of these officials amounts to Rs10 (for all Munshi clerks in Dist. Courts & the Hd Munshi in Sub courts), Rs15 (Sub court Sheristedars) & Rs20/- (Hd Munshis of Dist Courts), the promotion to officials of the Municipl Courts is [mostly] one of Rs5/- ~~only in the case of all except certain Hd Munshis and~~ 2) the other reason urged by the officials of the Bangalore Dist Court is that certain officials in Municipl Courts who were junior to them have begun to draw higher pay as the increase that they has at once is spread over a period of five years in the case of these officials of District Courts. This can perhaps be remedied by effecting transfers between several Courts in the Division when a senior can have the immediate promotion and

[x] i.e. Diffce between the maximum & minimum pay

Vide scale given in G.O. Passed V.J. 459-70 Ch. 278-13-3 9/5/8 7/2/15

J Encl 2 to Sl 1

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

the junior the progressive one.

3) Art 81, M.S.R., lays down that it is contrary to the principle of progressive pay to grant an increment before it is due and that such a grant shoues be restricted to these cases where a personal allowance is justified. If the request is nevertheless prima facie considered favourably, Br II will be consulted and further information will be called for from the Chief Court regarding the no of years for which the maximum pay of the scale or the minimum pay of the new one has been drawn by each of the officials included in the statement upon which the information cannot be clearly made out.

I, Encl 3 to Sl 1

Subs pr order.

Reg. 18/8/16 RSR

4) Br II may be consulted.

is 8/3

Encl W. O. No. 1851 of 15 RSR

Br II

Subs. 5) DMG Glos. 20.3.16.

In Progressive Appointments increments can be earned only by approved service & the proposal to grant increments for every year's service on present pay is financially objectionable & cannot be agreed to. In exceptional

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

2850

(4

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CS File No. 252 of 1915-16

Serial No.

Cases where present pay has been drawn for a long time say over 5 or 6 years one increment in advance may be given. More than this this Branch cannot agree to. As has been pointed out by the Administration Branch Senior officials should be made to put more by transferring them to the more highly ~~appointed offs~~ paid appointments and not by having resort to methods financially objectionable.

b) The 8 W Order of 1897 quoted under which persons in the Rev Dept were given such a concession, cannot be ~~followed~~ considered as authority for the violation of an express rule of the W.S.R. as now proposed

Ag. 22/3

Br III)
Subs.
CS 22/3

Ag. 22/3/16

c) The clerks who have now memorialised Govt do not seem to be justified in saying that the revision scheme which has involved an additional expenditure of over Rs 10000 a year, and which was sanctioned by Govt ~~offs~~ at the instance of the chief comt has become a source of grievance and discontent. The two units urged by them, are that under the scheme

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Sanctioned by Govt. Some of the clerks who were junior to them will become their Seniors, and that though some of the clerks in some of the appointments have already been in it for a number of years, will have to serve again in the same pay to earn their increments.

8) The Scheme itself did not authorise that juniors should be made to supersede their Seniors. Government Sanctioned nothing of the kind. Under the Scheme, certain appointments were allowed a pay higher than the one they were in, and other appointments were allowed a progressive pay. Thus in every case as far as possible a benefit was conferred. Considering the fact that these officials had no prospects whatever prior to this Scheme, it must be considered that a special benefit has been conferred on everyone of them in the shape of extra emoluments and prospective chances of higher pay. In giving effect to the Scheme, slight injustice to particular clerks might have been rectified by suitable transfers. In the case of these, the recommendations of the Financial Branch may be accepted. It is not possible in any case that Govt. should do that every one of the clerks should get a promotion under

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

Serial No.

the Revision Scheme. Merit was not the recommendation of the Chief Cmt, and that was not the object aimed at.

Submitted for orders.

Sd 23/8/16

First Member)

9) For those who have been drawing the Min^m Pay of new grades for some years, an increment may be given for every 2 or 3 years. To this extent, the recom^n of the Ch Cmt may be accepted.

27/8/16

m 29/8

Sd 29/8

10) The Finl Dept^t agree to one increment being given in advance in exceptional cases where present pay has been drawn over 5 or 6 years while the First Member worked grant-tall

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

2350

(7

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | CS File No. 252 of 1915-16

Serial No.

those who have been drawing the minimum pay of new grades for some years an increment for every 2 or 3 years of service on that pay. If this is a disagreement of views between the Finl Deptt & the Member in charge, the file has to be subd to the Dewan. Vide para 8 G.O. of 6th May 07.

W

Fl 8328-33. Leg. 9/16 30.3.16

Leg 30/3

11) Sub) The proposals might be considered at a meeting of the Council.

162. 14.4.16. Second member & Dewan

Dewan 14/4 28/4/16

18.4.16

12) The Officials have in many cases been on the same pay for a long time; and personally I would favour an arrangement by which two years' previous service might count for one increment and one additional year for an addl increment.

18/4/16

5622 18.4.16

13) Please bring up at a meeting of Council.

as ordered 16/5

16.5.16

14) The principle followed in the Govt. may be adopted.

17/5

18.5.16

(8

Extract from the Proceedings of the 339th Meeting of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja, held at Bangaloro on the 7th July 19 16.

---

20. SUBJECT.- (Clause xv of the schedule.)

Proposals for the grant of additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of the District and the Subordinate Judges.

OPINION OF THE COUNCIL.

(5) One increment for every four years may be given.

(Sd.)M.VISVESVARAYA,
DEWAN OF MYSORE.

"EXTRACT"

D. M. Narayana Rao 8/7

Secretary to Government,
General Department.

W. D. 1364—GPB—500—14-12-15

f 2350

(9

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Ch File No. 252 of 1915.16

Serial No.	
	16) To the Assistant Secretary, Br. III, for kindly submitting the file to the Second Member of Council with a draft ~~xxxxx~~ Final note. Draw 8/7
Ch 8/7	
	D.F.N. Subd 8/7/16 17) Submitted 8/7
1556 22.7.16.	Second Member 18)
	19) Final note Signed by the 2nd Member Draw up 8/7
	D.S.N. 8/7
	D.S.N. submitted 31-7-16 20) For favour of approval of the Dewan. 31/7
674 1.8.16	Secy) Dewan) Draw & Acco 1/8

(10)

Final Note by the Second Member of Council.

Subject:—

Proposals for the grant of additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of District and Subordinate Judges.

---

21) The scale of establishment of all subordinate Civil Courts in the State was revised in Government Proceedings No.J.469-70/Cts.270-13-3 dated 5th August 1915.

22) 2. On the representation of some officials of the Courts of the District and of the Subordinate Judge, Bangalore, that they have not been materially benefited by the scheme of revision, the Chief Court recommend the grant of as many increments to the officials of the three District Courts including Central Records and to the Sheristedars and Head Munshis of the three Subordinate Judges' Courts in the State, as the number of years of past service they have rendered in the grade.

23) 3. The Financial Department have no objection to the grant of one increment in advance in cases where the present pay is drawn for a long time as 5 or 6 years. The late First Member of Council, Mr. H.V. Nanjundayya considered that the recommendation of the Chief Court may be accepted to the extent of giving one increment for every two or three years for which the officials were drawing the minimum pay of their new grades.

24) 4. The question was considered at a meeting of the Council who are of opinion that one increment for every four years may be given. This may be approved.

M Chandrasekhara
Second Member of Council.

26th July 1916.

(11

Submitted to His Highness.

x.y.

x Page under disposal.

25) I submit herewith a 'Final[x] Note' by the Second Member of Council on a proposal[x] made by the Chief Court for the grant of additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of District and Subordinate Judges.

x Page 8 of office note.

26) 2. I solicit the gracious sanction of His Highness to the recommendation[x] of the Council.

M. Vishwesvaraya
4th Aug 1916

HR

2350

L.420

12

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Proposals for the grant of additional increments to certain officials of the Courts of District and Subordinate Judges.

148

Order.

~~KRW~~
8/8/16.

263
12.9

2158
8.9.16

19.9.16

8.8.16

27

2350

47

(13

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C/o File No. 252 of 1915-16

Serial No.

Draft put up.

28) 21.8.16

29) May be approved

Second Member

4955

21.8.16

30) Draft approved by the 2nd Member

22/8

31) Financial Deptt was consulted vide para. 5&6 its opinion not having been accepted in its entirety this file was not again referred to Finance as it should have been done upon the issue of final orders.

32) May the order be communicated?

33) Draft of fair and Sub'd for orders.

25/8.

34) May order be com.d? ~~He must~~ ~~How~~ ~~how it will work actually in practice and how many increments in advance will have to be paid in individual cases.~~

35) The result of the order would be the grant of increment in advance in 3 cases

36) and 2 increments in advance in 2 cases, ~~as~~ included in the Statement sent up by the Chief Court.

Resd) 37) Note & communicate

(dictated 38/2/9

Note this case in connection with Increments in advance at the Commencement of the Subordinate Courts

Noted 29/8/16

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPE—70,000—17-12-15

2358

F. R. S. 12]

(14

General and Revenue Secretariat.		In File No. 252 of 191 S.
	Serial No.	
	2	To the Registrar Csh: court the comptroller no 781-2 $\frac{25.8}{5.9}$ -16 Sanctions to ~~the~~ certain officials of the three St. courts and the Subordinate Judge's courts the grant of one increment Bar every four years service.

1 15

PD 27/9

No. 4001 dm 3
305

III
20/2
7m
dy

Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore, dated the 18th February 1916.

21st

15

From

No. J.2350

N. T. Copaliengar, Esq., B.A., LL. B.,

Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore.

1915-16
05
252-15
1

cls
23/2
4pm

To

V.R.Thyagaraja Iyer, Esq., M.A.,

Revenue Secretary to the Government,

in charge of the General Department.

S i r ,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No: J.469-70/Cts.270-13-3 dated the 5th August 1915 sanctioning the revision of the scale of pay of the Establishments of the Civil Courts in the State I am directed to submit for the orders of the Government copies of memorials addressed to this Court by the officials of the District Court of Bangalore including the Central Records except the Sheristedar and the Apprentice clerk and by the Sheristedar and Head Munshi of the Subordinate Judge's court, Bangalore, representing that most of them are drawing the minimum pay of the appointments they now hold for several years past, that while the pay of the officials in the Munsiffs' courts was raised by a lump sum, their pay was raised only by small annual increments and requesting that they may be granted the maximum pay under the revision scheme

or

16

or as many increments as they might have earned by past service.

I am to state that their request for increments for each year of approved service in the grade prior to the revision is, in the opinion of the Judges, not unreasonable. It is in accordance with the course adopted at the revision of establishments sanctioned by the Government in their Proceedings No: 11906-A/M.F.35-96 dated the 30th April 1897.

I am therefore to request that the Government may be pleased to grant as many increments to the officials of the three District Courts including the Central Records and to the Sheristedars and Head Munshis of the three Subordinate Judges' courts in the State as the number of years of past service they have rendered in the grade.

I am to add that the Sheristedars and apprentice clerks of the District Courts will have no increments in advance as they have already had their increase of Rs 20/- and Rs 5/- respectively.

A statement showing the effect of the present proposal is appended hereto.

I have the honor to be,

S i r ,

Your most obedient servant,

H.C.C.

REGISTRAR.

To

N.T. Copaliengar, Esq., B.A., LL. B.,

Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E .

(17

Through

Encl 1 6 Cls

R.B. Plumer, Esq., Bar-at-law,

District Judge, Bangalore Division,

B A N G A L O R E.

252-15

Respected sir,

We, the undersigned two officials of the Subordinate Judge's Court, Bangalore, beg to submit the following few lines for your favourable consideration and support.

We beg to submit that under the revision scheme, which was brought to effect from July last all the officials of this Court got a lump sum increase excepting the Sheristedar and the Head Munshi.

As we have been drawing the salary according to the old scale for some years, we request you will be pleased to send up a recommendation to Government to sanction the maximum pay to us, though the individuals who may be posted to these two appointments hereafter may have to earn their increments annually.

For

For which act of kindness we shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(15)

We beg, etc.,

Sd. A.P. Sabapathy Mudaliar,
Sheristedar.

(sd) M. Sesha Iyengar,
Head Munshi and Nazir.

Bangalore,
Dated 29th October 1915.

'COPY'

R E G I S T R A R .

H.C.C.

To

N.T.Gopaliengar, Esq., B.A., LL. B.,

Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore,

BANGALORE

(19

Through

The District Judge, Bangalore Division.

Encl No. 2 to Sl 1

Respected sir,

We, the undersigned officials of the District Court, Bangalore, beg leave to approach you with the following few lines trusting the same will receive your kind consideration and support.

2. We beg to submit that under the revision, since the pay of the appointments in the Munsiff's courts are raised by a lump sum while the pay of the appointments of corresponding grades in the District Court and the Central Records are raised only by small annual increments, the officials holding those appointments in the Munsiff's courts though juniors to some of us in the Distric Court and Central Records have risen above us in point of pay and what is more, certain officials who were drawing less pay than som of us, have gone above us, while we are made to work for 5 years to come up to their level. Consequently they become officials of higher status and better entitled to higher appointments than ourselves.

3. In these days of high prices, we all anxiously expecte

that

(28)

that the revision would come as a boon to us also and we would all be benefited thereby, but unfortunately it has become more a source of grievance and discontent to us when we see that officials in the Munsiff's courts who are by far our juniors and who are drawing less pay jump above us for no fault of ours.

4. The District Judge whom we looked up to for a just consideration of our claims along with those of the others in the Munsiff's courts, was pleased to say that though he considered our cases hard he had no voice in the matter and that we should seek redress at your hands.

5. The revision was kindly sanctioned by the Government on account of the high prices obtaining at present. While so, we beg to submit that it does not benefit us owing to our salaries being made progressive and the increments to take effect hereafter.

6. We beg to submit that most of us have been drawing the minimum pay of the appointments which we are at present holding for several years past. Taking into consideration our past servic in the appointments, we pray that we may be granted the maximum pay of the appointments now held by us under the Revision Scheme or granted at least as many increments as we might have earned already by past service in the appointments.

7. In this connection, we beg to submit that this is not without a precedent; for when the revision of the District and Taluk Establishments were sanctioned in April 1897, the holders of progressive appointments at the time were ordered to be given as many increments as the number of years for which approved services were rendered by them - Vide Para 5 of Government Proceedings No: 11906-A/M.F.35-96 dated 30th April 1897.

8. For which act of kindness, we shall, as in duty bound ever pray for your long life and prosperity.

We beg, etc.,

(Sd). H. Krishna Sastri, Head Munshi.
" L. Anantaramayya, Head Record-keeper
" S. Gurumurthiah, Dy. Munshi.
" C.Thangavelu Mudaliar, Head Clerk
" S. Somasundra Rao.
" C.S.Seshagiri Rao.
" V.C.Rangasami Iyengar.
" S. Venkatasubbayya.
" G. Rangappa.
" T. Ramachandrappa. (In Canarese).
" H. Nanjundiah.

Bangalore,
23 - 12 - 15.

'COPY'

R E G I S T R A R.

H.C.C.

Statement showing the effect of the present proposal.

Serial No:	Name of the official	Name of office held by him.	Date of appointment to present post	Pay before revision	Pay after revision	Pay as proposed now	Remarks.
			District Judge's Court Bangalore				
1	Mr. H. Krishna Sastri	Head Mounshi	21-8-1911	70/-	70/- in 70-4-90	Rs 82/-	
2	" S. Gurumurthiah	Deputy Mounshi	1-9-1913	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	52/-	
3	" B. Rhangaraju Naidu	3rd Mounshi	21-9-1911	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	46/-	
4	" V. Rama Rao	4th - do -	1-7-1915	30/-	30/- in 25-2-35	31/-	Is drawing Rs 30 from 25-8-13.
5	" E. S. Subba Iyer	5th - do -	1-12-1914	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	—	
6	" G. Narain a Sastri	Head clerk	25-8-1911	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	56/-	
7	" Somasundara Rao	Deputy clerk	1-7-15	35/-	35/- in 30-2-40	—	Has been drawing Rs 35/- from 8-12-14 temporarily as Assistant Sheristadar.
8	" B. S. Seshagiri Rao	3rd clerk	1-7-15	25/-	25/- in 25-2-35	27/-	
9	" M. B. Ramyasami Iyengar	Clerk	6-1-13	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25		

10	" S. Anantharamiah	Head Record Keeper	1-7-07	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	60/-	Working as 55/- from 9-2-14.
11	C. N. Narasimhia	Dy — Do —	1-7-15	25-1-30 1st Mohurrir court as Process Nazir.	35/- in 25-2-35		
12	S. Venkatasubbia	Asstt — Do —	21-7-13	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	25/-	Has been drawing 20/- from 25-6-19
13	H. Nanjundiah	Asstt — Do —	2-9-12	15/-	15/- in 15-1-20	17/-	
14	Y. Ramachandrappa	— do —	22-6-12	15/-	15/- in 15-1-20	18/-	Has been drawing 15/- from 14-10-1
15	G. Rangappa	— do - Sub Rotem	1-3-14	15/-	15/- in 15-1-20	20/-	Has been drawing 15/- from 6-6-08
		Subordinate Judges Court, Bangalore.					
1	Mr. A. C. Sabapathi Mudaliar	Sheristedar	19-2-13	60/-	60/- in 60-3-75	66/-	
2	" M. Seshiengar	Head Mohurrir & Nazir	1-6-14	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	42/-	
		District Judges Court, Mysore.					
1	Mr. Y. Ananthanarayanagar.	Head Mohurrir	1-9-1910	70/-	70/- in 70-4-90	86/-	
2	" M. S. Narasinga Rao	Dy. Mohurrir	28-6-1912	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	56/-	
3	" B. Krishna Rao	3rd — do —	29-7-1915	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	—	

Enl 1923

27

4	H. Shankaramaradhya	4th Mounshi	28-7-1915	30/-	35/- in 25-2-35	—
5	H. Krishnaswami	5th — do —	11-7-15	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	—
6	Sh. Sb. Gopaliengar	Head Clerk	11-7-15	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	—
7	C.Y. Raghava Mudaliar	Deputy clerk	20-6-14	35/-	35/- in 30-2-40	36/-
8	Y. Narasimhia	3rd. — do —	11-7-15	25/-	25/- in 25-2-35	
9	B.B. Varadachar	Clerk	2-7-14	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	21/-
10	Sh. S. Narayanaswami Sastri	Head Record Keeper	20-6-14	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	52/-
11	D. Krishnaswamiengar	Dy. Record Keeper	10-6-12	25/-	25/- in 25-2-35	31/-
12	Sultan Mohadin	Asstt: Do	7-7-15	15/-	15/- in 15-1-20	—
13	Mallia.	— do —	11-7-15	15/-	15/- in 15-1-20	—
		Subordinate Judge's Court, Mysore				
1	Sh. S.B. Ramgaswamiengar	Sheristedar	30-5-1912	60/-	60/- in 60-3-75	69/-
2	B. Ramaswamiengar	Head Mounshi	30-6-14	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	42/-

		District Judge's Court, Shimoga				
1	Mr. M. Lakshminarasimhia.	Head Mohrir	30-5-1912	70/-	70 in 70-4-90	82/-	Now acting as Sheristedar, District Court, Bangalore
2	" R. Srinivasiengar	Dy. Mohrir	1-9-1910	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	58/-	
3	R. S. Ramakrishnia	3rd — do —	1-9-1913	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	42/-	
4	K. Krishna Jois	4th — do —	10-11-1914	25/-	25/- in 25-2-35	—	
5	B. Lakshminaraniah	5th — do —	2-7-15	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	—	
6	Mr. N. Venkata Rao	Head Clerk	14-3-13	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	54/-	
7	S. Ramaswamiah	Deputy Clerk	6-9-1911	30/-	30/- in 30-2-40	36/-	
8	A. Venkata Rao	3rd — do —	1-9-11	20/-	25/- in 25-2-35	—	
9	G. Rama Rao	4th — do —	7-7-15	20/-	20/- in 20-1-25	—	
10	Mr. Govinda Rao	Head Record Keeper	16-11-13	50/-	50/- in 50-2-60	52/-	
11	H. Subba Rao	Dy. Record Keeper	1-11-1903	25/-	25/- in 25-2-35	35/-	

12	L. Joseph	Asstt. Record Keeper	11-7-1915	15	15/- in 15-1-20	—
		Subordinate	Judge's	Court,	Shimoga.	
1	Mr. A. Narasimhia	Sheristedar	1-11-1913	60/-	60/- in 60-3-75	63/-
2	" B. Lakshmipathia	Head Munshi	13-8-1907	40/-	40/- in 40-2-50	50/-

Chief Court of Mysore
Bangalore, 18th February 1916

N. Gopalacharlu

Registrar.

V 22/8

ab

Comp 2072/1400 8/9/16

Sanctioning advance increments to certain Officials of the Dt & Sub Court.

23

G.R.S. 28]

Cls File No. 252-15

Serial No. 2 -

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, *the* 191 .

READ—

Letter No 4001/305 dt 18/21 Feb 1916 from the Registrar, Chief Court, forwarding for orders of Govt. copy of a representation made by certain officials of the Courts of the Dt and the Sub ordinate Judges

Date of issue 25·8·1916. 5·9.

Signed by M.V.G. Sullivan Jr

ORDER THEREON.—No.

Bangalore that, as they have been drawing the minimum pay of the appointments now held by them for several years past, they may be granted the

over

SUBJECT.

GPB—50,000—1-12-12

48.3/2/16

2x

the maximum pay under the revision Scheme or as many yearly increments as they may have earned by past Service and recommending the grant of as many increments as the number of years of past service

Order thereon - No. 9781-2 Dy 25.8.1916.

Govt are pleased to sanction to the officials of the three Dt Courts including Central Records (except the Sheristadars and Apprentice clerks) and to the Sheristadars and Head Munshis of the three Subordinate judges' Courts in the State the grant of one increment for every four years' service rendered prior to 1st July 1915, in the appointments now held by them

date of revision order they are entitled to the increments for service rendered from this date

Yr Secy to Govt

Genl Dept

To The Registrar Ch Ct with ck No. 9783 Dy 25.8/5.9.1916

The Comptroller Fins Dept.

21.8.16